United Nations A/C.1/56/PV.22

General Assembly

Fifty-sixth session

Official Records

First Committee

22nd meeting

Monday, 5 November 2001, 10 a.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdös ..... (Hungary)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda items 64 to 84 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: I wish to draw the Committee's attention to informal working paper No. 5, which members have at their disposal and which is the inventory of what has to be done this morning. I wish to make two observations regarding the working paper and would ask members to make the necessary corrections and changes to it. Under cluster 1, nuclear weapons, add draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", which the Committee will be taking up this morning. Also in informal working paper No. 5, under cluster 6, confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.2 should be deleted, at least for this morning, because important consultations are being held on it. Thus, the basic number of draft resolutions to be considered will not change, but a draft decision and a draft resolution will change places between the morning and afternoon meetings.

The Committee will now proceed to consider the introduction of revised draft resolutions and to hear any general statements.

First, at this stage of our work, I wish to introduce revised draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1, which is being distributed in the various languages of the United Nations as I speak. It is entitled "Multilateral cooperation in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation and global efforts against terrorism", and is submitted by the Chairman of the Committee.

This draft resolution, one version of which, A/C.1/56/L.49, has already been distributed, is the result of a number of bilateral and multilateral consultations that I had on the subject with many members of the Committee. After the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49 on 23 October, I continued working with various delegations to accommodate as many preoccupations, concerns and viewpoints as possible in order to find language that would be acceptable to all. It was obviously impossible for me to get in touch with each and every member on this draft, but I stood ready to listen to the views of any interested delegation. I have received a good number of ideas and proposals to improve the text. I thank all members who, with their comments and amendments, have contributed to improving this text and making it more agreeable — not perfect, but something members can live with. It has been said more than once on these premises, but I repeat it nevertheless, that a Chairman's text is valid as long as it does not give complete satisfaction to anybody. Thus, I do not expect anyone to embrace draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 enthusiastically, or applaud it cheerfully, nor do I expect an outright rejection of it on the grounds that it is unacceptable.

What I sought to reflect in the text was a common denominator, a language one could live with, and

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

01-61893 (E)

formulations that could attain the minimum level of agreement. My basic purpose has been and is for the Committee to find draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 an acceptable undertaking, nothing more and nothing less. I ask members to consider draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 from that angle and — what is more important — to bear in mind the significance of what we are about to do here and now in the Committee on the subject-matter that is before us.

I spoke earlier about the particular circumstances in which our Committee, entrusted with questions of disarmament, non-proliferation and international security, has been meeting this year and hence about the need to revisit the way the Committee has been conducting its business thus far. The outpouring of human solidarity across the globe in the aftermath of the terrible tragedy in September and the sentiments that were aired here in the Committee as we launched our work early in October made this Chairman's initiative desirable and possible. Its espousal by the Committee would be indicative of a new state of mind in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Let us not allow the passage of time to weaken our resolve, within this body as well, to contribute to the global endeavour to overcome the unprecedented challenges of the twenty-first century by working together hand in hand and moving ahead in a meaningful way in the areas of competence of the Committee. That is how I summarize the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1.

More concretely, let us not allow differences and diverging vantage points to stand in the way of the adoption without a vote of this revised draft resolution. I know that some members could have added or deleted formulations, words, or commas in the draft resolution, but I ask members to look at it as a text that captures our basic preoccupations. I trust it does. As I have already said, it is of the utmost importance that we adopt this draft resolution without resorting to a vote. Let us rise to the occasion, as the challenges ahead of us are truly universal. They affect all the States represented in the Committee, whether small or big, weaker or more powerful.

Without wishing to sound too solemn, I should say that these challenges go beyond any consideration that might divide us. At this juncture of history, we are gathered here above all else as members of the human family, wishing to be counted in this common effort to preserve our future and our civilization.

I now call on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions before the Committee takes action on them.

Mr. Bar (Israel): My general statement relates to cluster 4, conventional weapons. I would have liked to make the statement after we had talked about nuclear weapons, but nevertheless I will gladly make it now.

The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, which is dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47, which we will discuss this morning under cluster 4, is first and foremost a humanitarian problem. It ultimately leads to the bloodshed of innocent people. It affects the basic right of people to lead their lives peacefully, without fear of getting killed simply for being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Israel had expressed its hope that the first United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects would adopt the goal of preventing the uncontrolled flow of arms, ammunition and explosives, which encourages indiscriminate attacks by terrorists and criminal organizations. The outcome of that Conference, the Programme of Action, is a first step that could contribute towards achieving that goal.

In the light of current events we wish to reiterate our position, namely that the best way to curb the illicit circulation of small arms and light weapons throughout the world is through a strong national commitment and determination supplemented by regional coordination and cooperative international efforts. Israel is of the view that proper action by States is necessary for the containment of this phenomenon. That includes the adoption by all States of a clear and explicit political commitment to bar all entities under their jurisdiction from engaging in the illicit traffic in arms, ammunition and explosives to terrorists and to withhold assistance to outside elements involved in that traffic.

The menace of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons can be substantially reduced if countries make a firm decision to stop it. As a first step, they should institute rigorous measures to control the circulation of arms within their territories as well as the transfer of arms to others. This control should be included in national legislation and effectively enforced.

Israel's legislation and regulation reflect its policy regarding the obstruction of illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons, ammunition and related technical know-how. Israeli law and export controls encompass all aspects of the firearms trade: negotiations, production, licensing, marketing and registration, and are strictly enforced. Israel's firm arms transfer policy includes tight controls aimed, inter alia, at the prohibition of exports to regions or States under a United Nations Security Council sales embargo, non-State entities, subversive and underground movements, terrorist or guerrilla groups, criminal organizations or areas of ongoing internal armed conflict between rival parties. Moreover, Israel's regulations concerning the export of small arms and light weapons obligate the exporter to apply for separate and specific licences from the relevant authorities, including negotiation permits and export licences.

In addition, Israel invests in research, development and production of new technologies and equipment to prevent the illicit smuggling of arms along its border and points of entry. Israel is willing to work with other countries in its region in coordinating efforts to limit the illicit spread of small arms and light weapons. We hope that Israel's extensive experience in this area can be utilized in a cooperative regional approach, as part of a shared global commitment to end the tragedies caused by these weapons.

The flow of arms to terrorist groups has served to fuel the conflict in our region by increasing the number of illegal arms in terrorist hands, thereby adding to human suffering, animosity and instability in the region. Terrorism, after all, is only viable if countries allow, and even support, its capabilities through weapons transfers. We wish to seize this opportunity to call upon our neighbours in all the countries in the region to adopt a responsible policy and to take the necessary measures to stop the flow of arms from their territories to terrorist groups. We expect the international community, in the context of a global campaign against terrorism, to join us in that call.

Finally, Israel views the adoption of the Programme of Action last July as an important achievement that reflects the international community's will to seriously address this problem. We hope that this political commitment will translate into firm action by States to stop the uncontrolled flow of arms, and we therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47. We believe our common interests would be best served by focusing on the implementation of the agreed Programme of Action.

Mr. Maandi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): My delegation has asked for the floor to express its point of view on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". The draft resolution, introduced by Myanmar, has been co-sponsored by my country since the first year that one was introduced. In sponsoring this draft resolution once again, Algeria wishes to reaffirm its commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the promotion of a new era based on collective and universal security, clearly differentiated from the nuclear-use theory of the past. At the same time, we wish fully to support the praiseworthy efforts continuously being undertaken to give the necessary momentum towards nuclear disarmament, which, for all of us, remains the absolute priority because of the threat nuclear weapons pose to international peace and security. The draft resolution before the Committee goes beyond the fact that we welcome what has already been achieved in the area of disarmament and the positive results of the Sixth Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 2000, especially the commitment made by the nuclear States totally to eliminate their nuclear arsenals — a commitment that we all wish to see become a reality. Indeed, it proposes a very relevant and practical series of measures to pave the way towards the achievement of the noble objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, an objective that was established by the international community in 1945 and repeated in 1978 during the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The convening of an international conference on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects to identify and deal with concrete measures of nuclear disarmament; the establishment of an ad hoc committee to commence negotiations on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament; and the commencement, in the Conference on Disarmament (CD), of negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear purposes — all constitute, in the view of my delegation, concrete proposals able to give true impetus to the nuclear disarmament process. Thus my delegation supports this draft resolution and calls upon all delegations to give it their broad support.

Ms. Badawi (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt is taking the floor to make the following general statement on cluster 4, and before the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". The delegation of Egypt participated actively in the negotiations that led to the adoption by consensus of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. That Programme of Action reflects the international, common position guiding the global work in this field. The overwhelming majority of States believe that our future international work should be based only on and promptly bound by the agreement reached in this regard. Therefore we recognize that draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 is the only resolution dealing with this subject, namely the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects, and will thus guide our future work and the follow-up process.

A couple of days ago, this august body adopted a draft resolution relating to the subject of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons which, regrettably, contradicts the commitment that was just undertaken in July 2001. Our concern is that this precedent may put all our international work in this field in real jeopardy and may even challenge the seriousness of our commitments before they are implemented. We believe that it is the prerogative of each State and region or subregion to adopt and implement any policy that would serve its or their interests. However, this should be confined to the concerned States or regions only.

In spite of the aforementioned concerns, the agreed language reached in the Bamako Declaration reflecting the common African position on the Programme of Action, as well as resolution 54/54 V — which I have copies of and will gladly share with interested representatives — my delegation refrained a couple of days ago from engaging in a procedural debate and formally putting forward our amendment in order to avoid questioning the seriousness of previous commitments already made in this regard, as well as reopening draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 to further debate.

Mr. Pearson (New Zealand): I wish to make a general statement under cluster 1 on behalf of Australia, Mexico and New Zealand on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). This issue is before us today in draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1.

Australia, Mexico and New Zealand for many years have addressed the importance of a comprehensive test-ban treaty in the United Nations. We were delighted after this long advocacy that the Treaty was adopted in the United Nations on 10 September 1996. Since then our three countries have worked actively with other signatory and ratifying States to achieve its entry into force. In this context we welcome the Ministerial Conference to facilitate that goal that is to take place in New York on Sunday and will be chaired by Mexico.

Being mindful of the pre-eminence of this Conference, our objective this year in the First Committee is to achieve a consensus outcome. Our goal is simply to inscribe the CTBT on our agenda for next year. The draft decision we have tabled is therefore a very modest initiative. We amended it, removing the reference to last year's United Nations General Assembly resolution, in the expectation that we could secure a consensus. We also delayed consideration of the decision to that end. Our intentions in draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1 are transparent and straightforward, no more, no less. We therefore urge support for this draft decision.

The CTBT will contribute to international peace and security in unmistakable ways. By creating an international norm prohibiting all nuclear-weapon test explosions and any other nuclear explosions, the Treaty will make a real contribution to preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and will provide impetus to the process of their total elimination.

Ratification of the CTBT is one critically important step that all States could take now to underline their commitment to promoting our common security. Our three countries intend to table a resolution addressing this imperative at next year's session of the First Committee.

Mr. León González (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have asked for the floor to explain Cuba's position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1. My country, as it has done with similar resolutions in previous years, will vote in favour of it. We have before us a draft resolution that is one of the most complete in terms of nuclear disarmament. The text emphasizes the fundamental principles agreed upon by the international community long ago so that nuclear

disarmament should have the priority in the field of disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 takes up various proposals for measures that have been traditionally put forward by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) as a means to achieve nuclear disarmament.

Nuclear weapons continue to pose the greatest challenge to the international community in the field of disarmament and arms control. Cuba greatly deplores the fact that the Conference on Disarmament, the world's single multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament, has still not been able to establish an ad hoc committee to negotiate nuclear disarmament because of the opposition of one nuclear Power. My country will continue to devote its efforts to ensuring that the Conference on Disarmament will meet the wishes of the majority of the international community, as expressed year after year during the adoption by the General Assembly of a resolution relating to nuclear disarmament.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on those draft resolutions and decisions in informal working paper No. 5 as amended at the beginning of the meeting.

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1 before a decision is taken.

Mr. Westdal (Canada): I take the floor briefly before the vote to express Canada's support for the draft decision before the Committee in document A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty" (CTBT).

Canada has always been a strong supporter of the CTBT as a landmark achievement of the Conference on Disarmament and as a measure essential to both non-proliferation and disarmament efforts. We have been very active, together with other States, in promoting its early entry into force and we therefore regret that in the week before the Conference designed to advance this very goal, a decision on the CTBT which is purely procedural has had to be brought to a vote.

Mr. Lint (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): At the start of the meetings of the First Committee I had the opportunity as President of the European Union to make the following statement relating to draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1 on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

"... the Union wishes to reiterate that it has spared no effort in promoting the early entry into force of the Treaty and universal accession to it. It has made over 70 representations and has also argued in support of the Treaty in all the appropriate international forums. It is firmly committed to persevering in this effort. It is with this in mind that the Union reiterates its full support for the efforts to establish the verification regime rapidly and in accordance with the Treaty. To ensure that the resolve of the international community does not weaken, its calls on all the States that have not yet done so to sign the CTBT without delay and unconditionally, particularly the 13 States on the list of 44 States whose ratification is required for the Treaty to enter into force. ...

"In line with the commitments that they assumed by signing and ratifying the CTBT, the European Union member States remain committed to the full implementation of the verification regime and the early entry into force of the Treaty."

That is the reason why member States of the Union will give their support to draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", which was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 22 October 2001.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus,

Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted by 140 votes to 1.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations who wish to explain their vote or position on the draft decision just adopted.

Mr. McGinnis (United States): The United States delegation asked for a vote on the decision embodied in document A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1 because the United States does not support the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). As delegations are aware, in October 1999 the United States Senate voted not to give its advice and consent to ratification of this agreement. While the Administration has no plans to seek reconsideration of the Senate's action, let me make clear that the United States intends to maintain its moratorium on nuclear testing in effect since 1992. Further, we urge all States to maintain existing moratoriums on nuclear testing.

The United States takes seriously its obligations under the arms control agreements to which we are a party. In that vein I want to reiterate and emphasize the strong support of the United States for the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). As a nuclear-weapon State, the United States understands its special responsibility under article VI of the NPT.

Ms. Frøholm (Norway): As noted in our general statement, Norway attaches the greatest importance to achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and its early entry into force. Bringing the Treaty into force will be essential for broader efforts to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons. The upcoming article XIV Conference should be instrumental in achieving that end. Therefore Norway voted in favour of draft decision A/C.1/56/L.10/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the next item under cluster 1, nuclear weapons, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1.

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on this draft resolution before a decision is taken.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): Pakistan is committed to the achievement of general and complete nuclear disarmament. We have in the past supported the draft resolution on nuclear disarmament introduced by Myanmar, together with the other non-aligned countries. However, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 incorporates provisions in the sixth preambular paragraph, the final preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 6 and 9 which are inconsistent with the position of my delegation. We shall therefore be constrained to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1.

Mr. Meléndez (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I just want to ask that El Salvador be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1.

The Chairman: We have taken note of the request made by the representative of El Salvador.

Does any other delegation wish to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken? There appear to be none. The Committee will therefore proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested. There will be two votes on this draft resolution: a separate vote on operative paragraph 9 and then a vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", which was introduced by the representative of Myanmar at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 30 October 2001. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 are contained in the draft resolution itself. In addition, El Salvador has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Committee will first take a recorded vote on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

> "Welcomes the positive outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States, in the Final Document of the Review Conference, to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all States parties are committed under article VI of the Treaty, and the reaffirmation by the States parties that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and calls for the full and effective implementation of the steps set out in the Final Document;".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan.

Abstaining:

Cuba, France, Monaco, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 was retained by 132 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti,

Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Cyprus, Georgia, India, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Mauritius, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, San Marino, Sweden, Ukraine.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 90 votes to 35, with 19 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Seetharam (India): My delegation has requested the floor after the vote on the draft resolution to state that my country, in view of its long-standing and unwavering commitment to nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons globally, has supported the resolution in the past. We are, however, disappointed at the turn the resolution has taken in recent years. The draft resolution has diluted a number of long-held Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and G-21 positions on nuclear disarmament which my country fully supports. Further, our views regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are well known. Therefore, we called for a separate vote on operative paragraph 9 and voted against, while abstaining on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation supports the objectives and the main thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". On the issue of nuclear disarmament, China shares many of the positions expressed in the draft resolution. These include, inter alia, the commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons, opposition to the nuclear deterrent doctrine characterized by the first use of nuclear weapons, the call for an unconditional commitment of nuclear-weapon States to the non-first-use of nuclear weapons and the early commencement of negotiations on an international legal instrument on the non-use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-weapon-free zones. The Chinese delegation believes that in addition to the content of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, the following principles and measures are also essential to the realization of the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

First, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) is a cornerstone for maintaining the international strategic balance and stability and constitutes a base for the advancement of the process of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. It is therefore necessary to urge its States parties to comply strictly with the Treaty in its entirety.

Secondly, the countries with the largest nuclear arsenals should continue to take the lead in drastically reducing their nuclear weapons. That will help to improve the international security environment, thus making it possible for the other nuclear-weapon States to take part in the nuclear reduction process.

Thirdly, measures such as those related to nuclear transparency can only be implemented in an international environment of peace, security, stability and trust. They must be integrated into the process of nuclear disarmament and based on the principle of undiminished security for all the countries concerned. In this respect we see some insufficiencies in draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1. While we voted in favour of the draft resolution, the Chinese delegation hopes that it can be further improved with a view to moving the process of nuclear disarmament forward.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". As I stated in my explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.45, concerning the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), it is Japan's fervent desire and its firm belief that the use of nuclear weapons should not be repeated and that continuous efforts should be made towards achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. Having said that, as far as draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.44/Rev.1 is concerned, I should like to state the following: my delegation notices a number of positive elements concerning nuclear disarmament in this draft resolution. For example, it rightly contains a reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. My delegation also appreciates that the draft resolution incorporates some steps of nuclear disarmament agreed in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference. However, the draft resolution does not command the full support of my Government. We made the difficult choice to abstain in the voting. One reason is that it still contains the element of a specified time frame for nuclear disarmament. My delegation firmly believes that steps for nuclear disarmament should be realistic and progressive with the involvement of the nuclear-weapon States from the very beginning of the process. Therefore my delegation takes a somewhat different approach from the draft resolution towards the shared goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to explain its position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on the next item in informal working paper No. 5, draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60, entitled "United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament".

I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. León González (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba was prepared to support the draft in document [A/C.1/56/L.16]. The text would immediately follow through on the expressed desire embodied in the Declaration of the Millennium Summit by our leaders last year, in which they stated, among other things, in the list of major issues:

> "To strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, and to keep all options open for achieving this aim, including the possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers". (*resolution 55/2, United Nations Millennium Declaration, para. 9, ninth subparagraph*)

Cuba does not share the view that this conference would block other discussions on nuclear disarmament that have been unfolding in other forums. Nor do we support the idea that the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty constitutes the basis for efforts towards nuclear disarmament. The fact that we still have more than 30,000 nuclear weapons after more than 30 years of the NPT's existence shows, we feel, that the effectiveness of that regime leaves much to be desired. The holding of an international conference to discuss the matter of nuclear disarmament has been a long-standing proposal proffered by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Ever since it was first put forward, Cuba has supported it.

It is imperative for us once again to discuss the issue of nuclear disarmament, not to belittle everything that has already been achieved, including valid principles and gains in terms of nuclear disarmament, but to look towards the future from our vantage point here at the beginning of the third millennium. Cuba supports the convening of a United Nations conference to identify appropriate ways to eliminate nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament. It is our view that the inclusion of this item on the General Assembly's agenda will mark a first step in that direction.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to explain its position or vote before action is taken on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60, entitled "United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament", which was

introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 2 November 2001.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, Germany, Israel, Monaco, Poland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Yugoslavia.

Draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60 was adopted by 101 votes to 7, with 34 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft decision just adopted.

Mr. Broucher (United Kingdom): I take the floor to explain our vote against draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60. I have the honour also to speak on behalf of France and the United States.

Like Mexico and most other countries, the United Kingdom, France and the United States are committed to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) process as the cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation and the essential foundation for nuclear disarmament. We believe that to establish a separate process would conflict with this approach. For that reason we do not think that the conference, originally proposed in document A/C.1/56/L.16, would contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament. We think it unlikely that further discussion at the fifty-seventh session would lead us to change this view. We have therefore voted against the decision.

Mr. Heinsberg (Germany): Like Mexico, Germany is concerned about the continued risk for humanity represented by the possibility that nuclear weapons could be used. We therefore reaffirm our determination to contribute to the implementation of article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The NPT is the cornerstone of the non-proliferation regime and the essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament. We particularly stress the need for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps for a systematic and progressive effort to implement article VI of the NPT, as agreed at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. The implementation of these 13 steps requires focused efforts. Nothing should distract us from the obligations we undertook as parties to the NPT. Thus, we consider pursuit of these efforts within the context of the NPT process leading up to the next review conference in 2005 to be of key importance. Likewise, we deem it to be of the utmost urgency to overcome the deadlock in the work of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Linkages which have led to the deadlock should be abandoned with a view to starting negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty as rapidly as possible.

In light of these priorities, and with a view not to undermine the NPT process or the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral negotiating forum,

we do not consider it appropriate at this juncture to convene a United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament. Therefore, my delegation was not in a position to support the draft decision.

Mr. Bar (Israel): I take the floor in order to explain the vote of Israel against this draft decision. Naturally, Israel does not object in principle to a discussion of ways to eliminate nuclear danger or of eventual nuclear disarmament, but given the present politicized environment surrounding discussions of nuclear issues and the platform that they give for singling out countries, as reflected again in the Committee's draft resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", we do not believe that such a discussion would be a constructive one.

The Chairman: That seems to conclude this series of statements after the adoption of draft decision A/C.1/56/L.60.

The Committee will now proceed to cluster 4, conventional weapons, and take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): We are happy to note the success of the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, held in July this year. The Programme of Action adopted by the Conference may not be perfect, but it is a significant step forward. In our view, efforts now should focus on its implementation. Ambitions to achieve more and quickly, though understandable, may turn out to be counter-productive at this stage. We should move slowly but steadily. Pakistan is already in the process of implementing the Programme of Action. The Government of Pakistan recently launched a massive campaign to collect illicit weapons. At the same time the Government has stopped issuing licences for new weapons, while a ban on the display of weapons has also been imposed and is being implemented completely and vigorously. We are confident that our efforts will produce good results, cleansing our society of the repercussions of the two decades of conflict in Afghanistan. Pakistan, therefore, will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Aho-Glele (Benin) (*spoke in French*): I would like to request that Benin be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: We will act accordingly.

Mr. Meléndez (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to ask that El Salvador also be added to the list of sponsors of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: We will act accordingly.

Ms. Shodeinde (Nigeria): Nigeria wishes to be added to the list of sponsors of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: We will act accordingly.

Ms. Matsuo de Claverol (Paraguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Paraguay wishes to join the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: We will act accordingly. The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", which was introduced by the representative of Colombia at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 26 October 2001. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/56/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, El Salvador, Finland, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Russian Federation, Senegal and Ukraine. The programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 are contained in document A/C.1/56/L.61.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. McGinnis (United States): The United States is committed to countering the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. We are proud of our record and pleased that the Programme of Action from July's Conference encourages all nations to adopt similar practices for effective export and import controls, restraint in trade to regions of conflict, observance and enforcement of United Nations Security Council embargoes, the strict regulation of arms brokers, transparency in exports, and improving the security of stockpiles and destruction of excess stocks. These measures taken together form the core of a regime that, if implemented by all countries, would greatly mitigate the problems caused by the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. And — what is important — we are pleased that this draft resolution will move the Programme of Action forward. For that reason we have joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

We are also committed to budget discipline at the United Nations. We must all keep a careful eye on our budget priorities and maintain a critical perspective on those areas we can make more efficient and more effective. The United States believes that the programme budget implication analysis for this draft resolution requires additional discussion. However, because of the importance of the substantive elements of this draft resolution, the United States has chosen to join the consensus and will address the financial elements of the document in the Fifth Committee.

Ms. Raholinirina (Madagascar) (*spoke in French*): I wish to express Madagascar's desire to join the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.47.

The Chairman (*spoke in French*): We will act accordingly.

Mr. Lézona (Congo) (*spoke in French*): Congo would also like to join the list of sponsors.

The Chairman: We will act accordingly.

Mr. Fils-Aimé (Haiti): I should like to ask that Haiti be added to the list of sponsors.

The Chairman (*spoke in French*): We will act accordingly.

The Chairman: I suggest that the Committee now proceed under cluster 7, disarmament machinery, to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

I call first on delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29 before a decision is taken. There appear to be none.

The Committee will, therefore, now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", which was introduced by the representative of Sudan on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 29 October 2001.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.29 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee has come to the end of this morning's programme. So far as this afternoon is concerned, I have had a request for the floor from the delegation of Japan.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1, we are still engaged in last-minute consultations with a few delegations. If I may, I should like, at the beginning of this afternoon's meeting, to introduce orally a very small technical revision as Rev.2. I hope to be able to explain the reason at that time so that the Committee will be able to consider it and take action on it at the end of the day.

The Chairman: Before adjourning the meeting I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee who has an announcement to make.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to inform the Committee that Australia and Lebanon have joined the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.

United Nations A/C.1/56/PV.23

General Assembly
Fifty-sixth session

Official Records

First Committee
23rd meeting
Monday, 5 November 2001, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdös ..... (Hungary)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 64 to 84 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all agenda items

The Chairman: Informal working paper No. 6 is now being distributed; it contains food for thought on our work for this afternoon.

I call now on Mr. Evgeniy Gorkovskiy, Director of the Department for Disarmament Affairs and Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs.

Mr. Gorkovskiy (Director of the Department for Disarmament Affairs and Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs): The physical operation of the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific from Kathmandu was addressed by the representative of Nepal last week, at the 20th meeting of the First Committee. In view of that, I would like to recall the following developments in order to place the facts on record. The Regional Centre was established by the General Assembly in 1987 by its resolution 42/39 D of 30 November 1987, which stated that the Centre was established "on the basis of existing resources and of voluntary contributions that Member States and interested organizations may make to that end" (*para. 1*). While the P-5 post of Director of the Regional Centre is funded from the regular United Nations budget, the operational costs of the Centre are to be financed by the host Government. The Director of the Regional Centre has been successful over the years in securing voluntary contributions from interested Member States in support of the Centre's programme of activities. Nevertheless, it should be noted that donor countries have stipulated that their contributions are for financing certain specific activities and not for covering the operation and maintenance costs of the Centre.

Owing to the unavailability of premises to house the Centre in Kathmandu and of clear assurances on the financing of local operational costs, the Regional Centre has been operating since its inception from United Nations Headquarters in New York. On the basis of that arrangement, a host country agreement and a letter of understanding between His Majesty's Government of Nepal and the United Nations were signed in June 1988. The General Assembly, in its resolutions 54/55 C and 55/34 H, requested the Secretary-General to conduct consultations with Nepal as well as with other Member States concerned and with interested organizations to assess the possibility of enabling the Centre to operate effectively from Kathmandu.

Pursuant to those requests, protracted consultations by the Secretariat finally yielded the following positive outcomes. During his visit to Nepal in March 2001, the Secretary-General discussed with the host Government the issue of relocating the Regional Centre, and he was assured that Nepal was committed to hosting the Centre in Kathmandu as soon

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

01-61905 (E)

as possible. At the same time, in March this year, the Department for Disarmament Affairs, in cooperation with the host Government, identified an appropriate building in Kathmandu to house the Regional Centre. Subsequently, the Department prepared a draft host country agreement and a letter of understanding and, in March, forwarded both to the host Government for consideration.

Four months later, in August this year, the Department for Disarmament Affairs was informed over the telephone that the Permanent Representative of Nepal had been authorized to sign the letter of understanding, with minor amendments, to be exchanged between the host Government and the United Nations. The Department was also informed that the letter of understanding should refer to the 1988 host country agreement pending the conclusion of a new agreement, since it bore no substantive difference from the host country agreement presented by the Department in March 2001. That same information was later conveyed in writing on 28 August by the Permanent Mission of Nepal.

Since there has been a lapse of 13 years since the 1988 host country agreement was signed, the Department sought the advice of the Office of Legal Affairs as to whether the proposal of the host Government could be acceptable. The Office of Legal Affairs responded on 26 September that the proposal of the host Government to refer to the 1988 agreement would be acceptable pending the conclusion of a new agreement, if it were changed to reflect current practice. In the meantime, the Permanent Mission of Nepal, in a note verbale of 2 October, informed the Department that Nepal was now ready to sign the host country agreement and the accompanying letter of understanding presented to it in March 2001. On the basis of that new information, the Department forwarded the 2001 host country agreement to the Office of Legal Affairs for clearance. Subsequently, on 17 October, the Department submitted to the Permanent Mission of Nepal the 2001 host country agreement, as revised by the Office of Legal Affairs, for its consideration. The Department was notified by the Permanent Mission of Nepal on 18 October that, since approval of the revisions had to be sought from its Government, it was not in a position to sign the revised 2001 agreement in time for action on the draft resolution on the Regional Centre.

With regard to the objection of the host Government to the provision of immunities and privileges to United Nations officials, regardless of their nationality, raised by the representative of Nepal in his statement before the Committee last week, the Secretariat would like to note that that provision is contained in article V, section 18 (a), of the General Convention of the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly on 13 February 1946 as an annex to its resolution 22 (I), to which His Majesty's Government of Nepal is a party, and that the text has been revised to conform strictly to the Convention.

The Department for Disarmament Affairs would like to stress that the Secretary-General remains committed to relocating the Regional Centre to Kathmandu as soon as possible. The Department stands ready to dispatch the Director of the Regional Centre to Kathmandu, without delay, upon the signing of the host country agreement and the accompanying letter of understanding, which is an integral part of the agreement, covering the important issue of financial responsibility for the operation of the Centre. The Department therefore sincerely hopes that the process of finalizing the host country agreement and the letter of understanding by the host Government will be completed expeditiously so that the relocation of the Director can take place very soon thereafter.

The Chairman: I now want to inform the Committee that, at it is aware, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.2 has been causing some problems as far our schedule is concerned. I must tell the Committee that the consultations still continue. In order to wind up everything that we have in informal working paper No. 6, including draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.2, we will have to give the delegations concerned some time for consultations. This is why I was requested — and under duress I agreed to the request — to announce a half hour intermission in our work in order to get these delegations down to the table and work out a solution to their outstanding problems.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): As I indicated earlier, we have submitted to the Secretariat the second revision of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35. The understanding of my delegation is that, although we submitted the latest revision to the Secretariat about two and a half hours ago, it will still take some time for the revision to be printed. In order to help delegations to understand the latest revision, my intention is to give the revision

orally. If the recess of half an hour might be used to consider our second revision as well, it might be useful in order to speed up the process. My suggestion is therefore that, with the permission of the Chairman, I orally present the second revision before the meeting is suspended.

The Chairman: That would certainly be helpful. We heard the representative of Japan this morning with regard to the change he was willing to consider making to draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1. Perhaps this is the time for him to read out the change, which I believe is a change to operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1. When we come to the pertinent point in cluster 1, I will then ask representatives to consider the relevant draft resolution as A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.2, that is, as understood according to the oral amendments that are going to be presented by the representative of Japan.

I ask the representative of Japan to please read out the changes so that everyone can take them down in their own copies, and so that we may consider draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.2 in the light of the amendments that he is now going to read out.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): Thank you for your understanding, Mr. Chairman.

The revision contained in draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.2, which we have just submitted to the Secretariat, is of a technical nature. I hope that it will not present any problem to any delegation. It concerns operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

After consulting with certain delegations, we have decided to revise the paragraph by adding a short phrase at the very end of the sentence. I shall therefore read the paragraph out slowly with the new addition, which is very short.

> "*Calls* upon all States to redouble their efforts to prevent and curb the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, confirming and strengthening, if necessary, their policies not to transfer equipment, materials or technology that could contribute to the proliferation of those weapons, while ensuring that such policies are consistent with States' obligations under the NPT." (*A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.2, operative para. 9*)

In this particular paragraph we have used almost the same language as that which appears in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT); in article III of the NPT, concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear weapons; and, in particular, in paragraph 33 of the Final Document.

As this small revision is for the purpose of clarification, I hope it will not create any problems for anybody. We hope that this revised text, although presented orally, will be acted on by the Committee when the Chairman deems it appropriate.

The Chairman: The Secretariat has obviously been unable to prepare a clean text. But I would like to ask that when we get to the draft resolution entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons", delegations bear in mind operative paragraph 9 as orally amended by the representative of Japan a moment ago.

Having said that, I will suspend the meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 3.25 p.m. and resumed at 4.15 p.m.

The Chairman: When I was here as a member of my delegation, I always used to wonder during suspensions what was going on. Now I know — these commotions — there is always a reason for everything. A lot has been going on in the last 45 minutes, and I am optimistic about the prospects. However, without anticipating events, I give the floor to the representative of Iraq for a general statement.

Mr. Matook (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to speak on the draft resolution submitted by my delegation, contained in document A/C.1/56/L.8, on the grave harmful effects of depleted uranium on human beings and the environment. Depleted uranium is one of the products of processing chemical material within the nuclear fuel cycle.

This dangerous nuclear material is processed in a special manner in order to avoid the damaging effects of radiation on the environment and human beings. Depleted uranium is radioactive material that has harmful effects when used for military purposes, when minute radioactive particles are released into the air and enter the soil, where they will remain for millions of years.

The international community was deeply shocked by the use of depleted uranium. The effects of this use on many members of the human family have been

manifest in the prevalence of leukaemia and other dangerous diseases. The European Parliament has adopted a resolution that reads in part as follows:

(*spoke in English*)

> "whereas in several European countries there is growing concern about the consequences of exposure to radiation and inhalation of toxic dust resulting from the use of depleted uranium weapons, which may have affected a number of soldiers who took part in the military operations in the former Yugoslavia, particularly in Bosnia in 1995 and Kosovo in 1999".

(*spoke in Arabic*)

The emission of depleted uranium constitutes a kind of radiological weapon because it has toxic, radioactive effects on every living thing, animals and human beings.

The international community is trying to rid humanity of all weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons. Since the use of depleted uranium for military purposes is extremely destructive and harmful to military personnel and civilians alike, it must be banned in pursuit of international efforts to rid the world of all weapons of mass destruction.

The specialized international agencies that have dealt with the use of depleted uranium, including the International Atomic Energy Agency, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme, have not denied the radiological damage caused by the use of these weapons. However, they have sought in various ways to mitigate their extremely dangerous effects. They have conducted investigations into the small-scale use of such material in certain places. However, when such international organizations conduct genuine in-depth investigations into the large-scale use of depleted uranium, the results will be very shocking, because the accumulation of toxic radiation will prove truly immense.

We do not question the work and activities of international organizations that are specialized in this field. We would have been satisfied if they had been able to work in accordance with their scientific mandates, but we are concerned that they are subject to well-known political pressures.

Humanity must press this Committee to consider and study this very fraught and important question, which may have harmful repercussions on coming generations, including vulnerability to leukaemia and other dangerous diseases. We urge a halt to the use of these weapons against military personnel and civilians, who have already fallen victim to these dangerous radiological devices. We therefore call on this Committee to adopt the draft resolution before it in order to serve the interests of humanity and to reject well-known political views and positions of narrow self-interest.

Mr. Ileka (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*spoke in French*): On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.2, I wish at the outset to thank you, Sir, for kindly giving us the time to hold our final consultations.

Following the discussion we held in that allotted half-hour, I wish to make an oral revision to the text of the draft resolution. We have agreed to delete paragraph 8. As a result of this deletion, the corresponding programme budget implications, as contained in document A/C.1/56/L.59, should also disappear. Allow me also to sincerely thank all delegations for their willingness, understanding and spirit of compromise.

In conclusion, I wish to ask the Committee to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.2, as orally revised, by consensus.

The Chairman (*spoke in French*): The comments of the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo will be taken into account when we take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.2, as orally revised.

(*spoke in English*)

I would like to proceed according to informal working paper No. 6. The first item under cluster 1, nuclear weapons, is draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1*, as orally revised; entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". The asterisk indicates that the document has been reissued for technical reasons.

I call on those delegations wishing to explain their view or position before taking action on this draft resolution.

Mr. Markram (South Africa): I have the honour of speaking on behalf of the partner countries of the New Agenda Initiative — Brazil, Egypt, Ireland,

Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden — with reference to the draft resolution entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons", document A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1*.

One of the most significant outcomes of the 2000 Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was the unequivocal undertaking made by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all parties to the NPT are committed under article VI. Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1* misappropriates that outcome, in our view. By placing it in operative paragraph 3, as subparagraph (e), under the *chapeau* of "practical steps", it suggests that that undertaking has not yet been given. The placement of "an unequivocal undertaking" also creates a contextual linkage with general and complete disarmament, something we also cannot accept.

The unequivocal undertaking by nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals has been given. Let us be absolutely clear about that. It is not a step to be taken. Our foreign ministers noted this important distinction in a ministerial communiqué submitted to this Committee on 8 October. They also stressed that implementation of the other NPT steps is now the imperative. We appreciate that the sponsor of this draft resolution is well intentioned and committed to nuclear disarmament. We do not question that commitment.

We have consulted at length on A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1* to try to resolve our concerns about this draft resolution, pointing out that the New Agenda partners supported last year's resolution, as the eighth preambular paragraph correctly reflected the 2000 NPT Review Conference outcome. A return to that language would have accommodated the concerns we have on this year's draft resolution. Regrettably, this has not been reflected in A/C.1./56/L.35/Rev.1*. For this reason, the partner countries of the New Agenda will be obliged to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

The Chairman: As no other delegations wish to explain their position before the vote, we will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1*, as orally revised. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1*, as orally revised. The draft resolution is entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 21st meeting, on 2 November. The following countries have become additional sponsors of the draft resolution: Australia, Fiji, Lebanon and Papua New Guinea.

The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution. I would like to indicate that operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution was orally revised. That paragraph reads:

> "*Calls upon* all States to redouble their efforts to prevent and curb the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, confirming and strengthening, if necessary, their policies not to transfer equipment, materials or technology that could contribute to the proliferation of those weapons, while ensuring that such policies are consistent with the obligation of States under the Treaty".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova,

Romania, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, United States of America

Abstaining:

Belarus, Bhutan, Brazil, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Mauritius, Mexico, Myanmar, New Zealand, Pakistan, Russian Federation, San Marino, South Africa, Sweden

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1 was adopted by 123 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions.*

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China has always supported the complete prohibition and full destruction of nuclear weapons and the international community's efforts to achieve that objective. In keeping with this basic position, China agrees with the main thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1*, introduced by the delegation of Japan.

At the same time, however, we need to point out that there are some major drawbacks in the text of the resolution. First, as in previous years, this year's resolution makes no mention of some of the important principles and steps that are vital to the progress of nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, such as the special responsibility for nuclear disarmament that the countries possessing the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenals bear, the rejection of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence based on first use of nuclear weapons and the discontinuation of policies and practices associated with the nuclear umbrella and nuclear-sharing.

Secondly, compared to last year's resolution, this year's text has backtracked on some important issues. For instance, the wording on the preservation and the strengthening of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty that was contained in last year's resolution has been deleted from this year's text.

Finally, the Chinese delegation cannot accept mention of the report of the Tokyo Forum in the resolution because, in our view, many of the elements in that report are neither realistic nor reasonable. For these reasons, the Chinese delegation has once again abstained in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. Seetharam (India): The delegation of India has requested the floor after the adoption of this resolution to state its position.

India has an unwavering commitment to nuclear disarmament and the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons globally. However, the instrument ostensibly designed to promote global nuclear disarmament and genuine non-proliferation in all its aspects, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), has sadly proved to be ineffective. It is necessary to look beyond the old framework of the NPT and move towards the goal of equal and legitimate security for all through global nuclear disarmament. Basing this draft resolution exclusively on the NPT renders it flawed and thus unacceptable. The eighth preambular paragraph of document A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1, reading "Welcoming the successful adoption of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", refers to a document that is not balanced. That and the call for a moratorium on the production of fissile materials, in operative paragraph 3 (b), ignore political realities. The reference to nuclear tests in the sixth preambular paragraph and the call for the universality of the NPT in operative paragraph 1 are examples of hollow rhetoric. There are also a number of recommendations in the Tokyo Forum report referred to in the seventh preambular paragraph which fall in the same category.

While we agree with the basic objective of the draft resolution, namely the global elimination of nuclear weapons, there are numerous elements in it which remain unacceptable. Therefore, my delegation has cast a negative vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Heinsberg (Germany): Germany fully shares Japan's commitment to the cause of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and, in particular, to the full implementation by all States parties of their obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation

of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The NPT remains the cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and the essential foundation for nuclear disarmament. We attach particular importance to the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Its adoption by consensus strengthened the NPT and the nuclear non-proliferation regime as a whole.

Germany voted in favour of the draft resolution. It has done so on the understanding that it only enumerates some of the practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement article VI of the NPT, as agreed by the 2000 NPT Review Conference. We do not interpret it as calling into question the comprehensive commitment by the State parties to the NPT to implement the conclusions of the Final Document, including the practical steps in their entirety.

Mr. Coutts (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Chilean delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1, which was introduced by Japan, without prejudice to some changes introduced this year. We appreciate the spirit behind the draft resolution. However, we would like to state for the record that we are not fully satisfied with one of the changes, which, in our opinion, detracts from the unequivocal commitment of nuclear-weapon States to completely eliminate their nuclear arsenals. For us, this is one of the most important political outcomes of the last NPT Review Conference.

Mr. Maiolini (Italy): I have asked for the floor to explain Italy's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1. Through its vote, Italy intended to acknowledge document A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1 as an improvement on the initial version of A/C.1/56/L.35. My delegation highly appreciates the wording on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), the express reference to the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) process and the language used to reaffirm the importance of a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

Nevertheless, we still find that the draft resolution contains a somewhat limited selection from among all the important elements contained in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Although the Document is still referred to, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1 has at times watered down the appropriate language, as is the case with reference to the START process, to which Italy gives utmost importance.

We appreciate Ambassador Noboru's presentation of A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1, which made expressly clear that the unequivocal undertaking mentioned in operative paragraph 3 (e) must be interpreted as a step that has already been taken. This authoritative interpretation of the text that we have just approved was indeed welcome. My delegation intends to ensure that no element of this draft resolution can impair the successful outcome of the NPT process. The next Preparatory Committee should proceed from this process, given that no part of this draft resolution should ever detract from the achievement of the 2000 NPT Review Conference Final Document or weaken the obligations therein.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): My delegation is taking the floor to explain its vote after the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". My delegation finds several provisions of the draft resolution unacceptable. The draft resolution places inordinate emphasis on non-proliferation rather than nuclear disarmament. We cannot endorse the premise of the eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs. Furthermore, we also entertain reservations on operative paragraph 11.

Pakistan, as a non-party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), understands that we are not under any obligation to implement operative paragraph 3, including several subparagraphs therein. Nor are we bound by any of the provisions which emanate from the NPT Review Conference or other forums in which Pakistan is not represented. This understanding enabled my delegation to abstain rather than vote against this draft resolution.

Mr. Ngoh Ngoh (Cameroon) (*spoke in French*): My delegation was not present in the room when draft resolution A/C.1/L.35/Rev.1 was adopted. We apologize for that. Had we been present, we would have voted in favour of the draft resolution. I hope that the Secretariat takes due note of this.

The Chairman: We have duly noted the observation made by the representative of Cameroon.

Mr. Müller (Austria): At the outset, I would like to thank the representative of Japan for having introduced the draft resolution entitled "A path to the

total elimination of nuclear weapons". Austria voted in favour of that draft resolution, as it contains many elements to which my delegation fully subscribes.

Austria wholeheartedly shares Japan's commitment to the cause of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and, in particular, to the full implementation by all States parties of their obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We attach particular importance to the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Its adoption by consensus was the result of a delicate balance having been achieved between different interests. We cannot, however, conceal our disappointment that operative paragraph 11, on the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards system and the additional protocols, falls short of our expectations and is considerably weaker than the corresponding text of last year.

The heinous attacks of 11 September have, in our view, clearly demonstrated that the strengthening of the IAEA's — in particular by strengthening its safeguards system — is one of the many measures that need to be taken to adequately address this new type of threat. The conclusion of additional protocols and the swift implementation of the integrated safeguards system are key elements for enhancing nuclear non-proliferation. Unfortunately, the language chosen for operative paragraph 11 this year does not, in our view, reflect the urgency with which these issues have to be tackled.

Mr. McGinnis (United States of America): The United States was compelled to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1*, primarily because of the language it contains on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Had that language been in line with the formula used elsewhere, the United States would have been prepared to recommend a different vote.

We believe that the spirit of the draft resolution is something to which we can fully subscribe, and we did so last year. At the same time, my delegation believes that nuclear disarmament will not be achievable in the absence of stronger non-proliferation controls to preclude the transfer of weapons of mass destruction and their technologies.

The United States has made clear its commitment to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and its readiness to contribute to the implementation of the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. The United States vote on the draft resolution today should in no way be seen as a repudiation of those parts of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1* that support the same principles.

Mr. de la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): The First Committee has just taken action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1*, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". One year after the adoption, by consensus, of the Final Document of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we believe that any draft resolution dealing with nuclear disarmament must faithfully reflect the delicate balance achieved in that text. My country believes that the draft resolution introduced to the Committee today by Japan fulfils that requirement, especially as it relates to two important issues that are inextricably linked: the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to eliminate their nuclear arsenals on the one hand, and the reference to general and complete disarmament on the other.

France, which is determined to fulfil all of the commitments it has entered into in the field of disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, this year felt able to support the draft resolution.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The elimination of nuclear weapons continues to be the main disarmament priority of the international community. Cuba has always supported initiatives to attain that goal as soon as possible. Despite its title, however, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1* deals with selective issues relating to non-proliferation instead of with nuclear disarmament itself. In contrast to the approach reflected in the draft resolution, Cuba does not believe that the path to nuclear disarmament is based on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the universalization of which is called for in operative paragraph 1. The NPT has not eliminated nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth, despite the fact that it has been in existence for more than 30 years. The unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States at the Sixth NPT Review Conference is being presented to us as something new, when in fact the commitments entered into are not new; they were part of the Treaty when it was adopted and should already have been fulfilled.

In order to eliminate nuclear weapons, we must immediately begin multilateral, non-discriminatory negotiations leading to the attainment of our goal within a clearly defined time frame. The draft resolution just adopted lacks a clear statement to that effect. Not even the recommendation in operative paragraph 3 (c), on the establishment of an appropriate subsidiary body of the Conference on Disarmament with a mandate to deal with nuclear disarmament, is very clear about the role that the Conference should play in this matter. The wording of that paragraph does not reflect the positions that the countries in the Non-Aligned Movement have traditionally supported in negotiations on nuclear disarmament within the context of the Conference on Disarmament. There is no mention by name of a special committee on nuclear disarmament or of the need for such a body to have a negotiating mandate.

For those reasons, as in earlier years, Cuba abstained on the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.35/Rev.1*. We do not doubt that the authors of the text had the best of intentions, but we hope that they will bear in mind our comments for the future.

The Chairman: We now turn to the last item under cluster 1, nuclear weapons: draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.8, entitled "Sub-item on the effects of the use of depleted uranium in armaments".

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of position before action is taken on the draft resolution.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the beginning of the year, newspaper headlines throughout the world were filled with reports of NATO's use of depleted uranium in the Balkans and its impact on the environment and on certain individuals involved in the war in Kosovo. People became aware — perhaps for the first time at the global level — of a problem from which some people had been suffering since 1991, as a consequence of the so-called Gulf war.

The debate continued throughout the year, though, unfortunately, not with the same level of intensity or transparency it had in the beginning. However, there was a concern that this was an extremely dangerous weapon, with incalculable consequences for the lives of human beings and for the environment in which we all live. At a time when humanitarian concerns have led to a strong international movement in support of the prohibition or control of certain kinds of weapons, it would be inexplicable if we were to fail to deal properly with the questions raised by the use of depleted uranium in armaments.

Cuba deems it absolutely necessary that there be a total prohibition on the manufacture and use of weapons using depleted uranium. Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.8 has the virtue of taking up for the first time in this Committee the question of the use of depleted uranium in armaments. The draft basically confines itself to calling on States and the relevant organizations to give their views on this matter.

We believe that this initial approach is a very sensible one, as it avoids unnecessary confrontations? and will enable States to offer their views on a matter that is of concern to all of us.

For all of these reasons, the delegation of Cuba will vote in favour of the draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.8, and we hope that the majority of delegations will also support it.

Mr. Durrani (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain Pakistan's position on the draft resolution entitled "Sub-item on the effects of the use of depleted uranium in armaments", as contained in document A/C.1/56/L.8.

My delegation does not agree with the implications of the second and third preambular paragraphs. In our view, depleted uranium munitions are conventional weapons. While it is legitimate to examine their effects on health from a radiological point of view — a matter that is already under International Atomic Energy Agency and World Health Organization scrutiny — the suggestion that these are weapons of mass destruction is not borne out by objective evidence.

My delegation will therefore be constrained to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Lint (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.8 on the effects of depleted uranium in armaments. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta

and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area Norway align themselves with this statement.

The European Union has decided to vote against the draft resolution on the effects of the use of depleted uranium in armaments. Two considerations have led us to take this position.

First, obviously, we cannot support the second preambular paragraph of the draft, which lists depleted uranium as a weapon of mass destruction. In addition, with respect to the fourth preambular paragraph, we would like to recall that international organizations such as the World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme have carefully studied the issue of the potential pathological effects of the use of depleted uranium in armaments, and they have concluded that at this stage, it has not been demonstrated that depleted uranium used in armaments has any notable effect on health or on the environment.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.8.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.8, under the item on general and complete disarmament, entitled "Sub-item on the effects of the use of depleted uranium in armaments".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 24 October.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Thailand, Tonga, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.8 was adopted by 49 votes to 45, with 39 abstentions.

The Chairman: I give the floor to those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. McGinnis (United States of America): The United States voted against the draft resolution entitled "Sub-item on the effects of the use of depleted uranium in armaments" (A/C.1/56/L.8).

The agenda of the General Assembly does not need a sub-item on this subject, especially since the World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme have already conducted thorough and convincing studies. Those studies in turn have concluded that the use of depleted uranium in armaments has not been shown to have a notable effect on the environment or on the health of human beings.

The second and third preambular paragraphs of the draft imply that depleted uranium could be considered a new type of weapon of mass destruction.

Although this assertion does not rise to the level of seriousness that might deserve a reply, it reinforces our conviction that voting "no" was the only appropriate alternative for the delegation of the United States.

Mr. Borrie (New Zealand): I wish to take this opportunity to explain New Zealand's position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.8, on depleted uranium.

New Zealand voted against this draft resolution because we do not consider that depleted uranium is a weapon of mass destruction and existing scientific evidence does not allow us to support the contention that radioactive particles from depleted uranium weapons are spread over large areas, contaminating soil and animal and plant life.

We also consider that work in this area is not a good use of the resources of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, when expert technical bodies such as the International Atomic Energy Agency, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme are best placed to carry out studies on this issue and have already done so.

However, the New Zealand Government is aware of the public concern relating to depleted uranium and continues to have an open mind about the results of any future studies and to possible effects of depleted uranium munitions. We welcome further scientific investigation of this issue.

The Chairman: We now turn to the next item on our agenda, in working paper No. 6, under cluster 4, conventional weapons.

We have before us draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.43*, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects". I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.43*.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.43*, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 26 October. In addition to the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in documents A/C.1/56/L.43* and A/C.1/56/INF/2, the following countries have become sponsors: Bolivia, Cambodia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Latvia, Nicaragua and Panama.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.43* have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Maandi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): In joining the consensus, my delegation would nevertheless like to indicate that we would have been more satisfied if the draft resolution on the very important issue of conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects had taken into account the comments made on operative paragraph 5. We believe that this paragraph is selective, since it highlights and emphasizes only five of the proposals of States parties to the Convention. This fact creates the risk of conferring on these five items a higher status than was conferred on other proposals made during the preparatory session or on proposals that could have been submitted during the 2001 Review Conference.

Mr. Thamrin (Indonesia): Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to make a brief explanation regarding my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.43*.

Indonesia is not a party to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. Furthermore, we have some difficulty regarding several concepts that have been incorporated into this draft resolution.

However, we have not stood in the way of its adoption by consensus.

Mr. Roslan (Malaysia): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its position after the adoption of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.43*. We would like to put on record the fact that Malaysia is not a State party to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and its Protocols thereto.

However, it is not the intention of my delegation to stand in the way of a consensus text, as we highly appreciate the initiator's and sponsors' sincere attitude and firm commitment to this issue, which led to the draft text contained in document A/C.1/56/L.43*.

Mr. Atieh (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation joined the consensus on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.43*. We are convinced that international efforts should be exerted to overcome any negative effects of the use of certain conventional weapons that may be deemed to have indiscriminate effects and cause excessive harm.

Although we joined the consensus, my delegation would like to state its reservation with respect to operative paragraph 5. This paragraph is not in keeping with the other provisions of this draft resolution. Indeed, operative paragraph 5 is incomplete and selective in that it refers to just a certain number of items, thus running the risk that these items may be construed as having a higher priority than other items.

Mr. Al-Hassan (Oman): Mr. Chairman, allow me to explain my delegation's position after the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.43* just adopted.

My Government is not a party to the Convention, although we strongly believe that it marks a step in the right direction. At the same time, we take into consideration the assurances that the sponsors of this draft resolution have given us concerning the new application on States that are not parties.

However, we would like to flag a point of concern — not a reservation at all — regarding operative paragraph 5, which actually notes a number of proposals.

We had hoped that this particular draft resolution would, as in the past, be adopted by consensus without new language being put forward.

Allow me to conclude by stating that we are firmly convinced of the noble intentions of the sponsors of this draft resolution, and we hope that in the future a further level of cooperation will be developed with regard to this particular issue.

The Chairman: Under cluster 6, "Confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments", we turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.2, as orally revised earlier today, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa".

I call on the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs.

Mr. Dhanapala (Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs): In the light of the fact that paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.2 has been deleted from the text by an oral revision, the provisions of the document on programme budget implications (A/C.1/56/L.59) related to that paragraph are no longer applicable.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.2, as orally revised. The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. May I take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.2, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairman: Under cluster 9, "Related matters of disarmament and international security", we turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "Multilateral cooperation in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation and global efforts against terrorism".

I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions before we proceed to take action on the draft resolution.

Mr. Lee (Republic of Korea): My delegation wishes to explain its position in support of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1. This very timely and forward-looking draft resolution seeks to promote multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in the United States. As the recent attacks made clear, we need to re-evaluate and redefine our thinking regarding new

threats to international peace and security. There is no question but that there is a clear need to strengthen both traditional and non-traditional approaches in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Indeed, we recognize the close connection between the issues of international terrorism and of multilateral disarmament and arms control. Combating terrorism in all its forms will require a broader response from the entire international community. In particular, I wish to underscore the need to pursue not only law enforcement strategies but also multilateral arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation measures in the fight against terrorism. In that regard, draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 is an important step in the right direction, so my delegation strongly supports the Chairman's text.

Mr. Sam (Sierra Leone): My delegation respectfully requests a 24-hour deferment of action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 so that further consultations can be held among members of the African Group.

The Chairman: The intention of the Chair, as we all know, was to wind up the Committee's work in the course of today. The only outstanding issue which has not yet been tackled is this draft resolution: A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1. If we were to go along with the request for a deferment, we would have to meet tomorrow. I also have to say that I have been in touch with the African Group as a whole, and it provided me with very interesting and rich revisions to the text. If I may speak my mind, I am honestly somewhat surprised by the request for a 24-hour deferral of action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1.

Mr. Ahipeaud Guebo (Côte d'Ivoire) (*spoke in French*): Although we of course align ourselves with the position of the Group of African States, my delegation would like to express the concerns it has with draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1.

Our first concern is about the fourth preambular paragraph, which refers to specific General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on terrorism. We wonder why resolution 3314 (XXIX) was not mentioned, even though it was supported by the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement and is a good basis on which to begin to establish a definition of what constitutes terrorism.

Our second concern is about the fifth preambular paragraph, which establishes a close link between international terrorism, on the one hand, and illicit arms-trafficking and the illegal movement of nuclear, chemical, biological and other potentially deadly materials, on the other hand.

The international community must agree on the meaning of the concept of terrorism in order to avoid a battle over words. Terrorism cannot be defined solely as extremist acts. Terrorism is both action and thought, mens reus and corpus reus.

Although we have no intention whatever of playing the devil's advocate, a psychological analysis of extremist acts nevertheless reveals that such acts are motivated by pent-up frustrations linked to injustice, a rejection of the other, the arrogance caused by the law of the stronger, and the conviction that there are no other choices. Those are the frustrations that are closely linked to extremists acts, and not the transfer of, or trafficking in, arms. In the end, the use of arms is just the tip of the iceberg. This is our understanding of things.

In my delegation's opinion, the illicit transfer of, and trafficking in, arms is of course dangerous to human life. We nevertheless believe that this is a totally different phenomenon. The delegation of Côte d'Ivoire is not fully convinced by the current language of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1. But, in response to the appeal made by the Chairman this morning, we would not object to any eventual consensus, taking into account that we need to agree on the essential points.

The Chairman: Let me respond right away to the three remarks and observations made by the representative of Côte d'Ivoire.

The first remark was with regard to a reference to a General Assembly resolution. Originally, as it will be recalled, we had a different formulation in draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49 as far as references are concerned. But, at the request of the Group of African States, I included General Assembly resolution 49/60 in the text. There were many other ideas about referring to each and every General Assembly resolution that had been adopted on terrorism. But, having consulted a number of countries and delegations, I decided that making a general reference, and then singling out those resolutions that have special relevance to what we are doing here, would be

more practical. I therefore thought it would not be wise or practical to enumerate all the General Assembly resolutions, which certainly exist, but to make instead a general reference to all General Assembly and Security Council resolutions — as is the case in this particular draft resolution, A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1.

The second observation made by the representative of Côte d'Ivoire regards the paragraph referring to a close connection. I must say that, as we all remember, this clearly comes from a very recent Security Council resolution that notes

> "the close connection between [inter alia] international terrorism and ... illegal arms-trafficking, and illegal movement of nuclear, chemical, biological and other potentially deadly materials". (*Security Council resolution 1373 (2001), para. 4*)

This is not a new thing. It is in the Security Council resolution; and it establishes a clear link between the fight against terrorism and the mandate of the First Committee. This is why it is singled out. It is included in the draft resolution with wording that reflects, very truthfully, Security Council resolution 1373 (2001).

On the last point made by the representative of Côte d'Ivoire, I am the last one to argue with him on the issue of injustices, frustrations and difficulties. But this draft resolution does not speak about that. We have to separate the subjects and see where the appropriate forum for discussing item "x" or item "y" is. Therefore, I trust that the appropriate forum will be discussing issues that have relevance to the problems and difficulties he alluded to. But this draft resolution, submitted in the First Committee, does not deal with injustice and frustration. Although that is definitely part of the whole picture, we have to focus on what we are called upon to do here. It is a politically symbolic gesture that we are called upon to make here, without going into the very many multifaceted issues that are related to international terrorism, about which the week-long debate in the General Assembly spoke abundantly.

Those are, I hope, very specific answers to the concerns raised by the representative of Côte d'Ivoire.

Mr. Zeidan (Lebanon): I would just like to state, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, that we support the position put forth by the African Group.

Mr. Ahipeaud Guebo (Côte d'Ivoire) (*spoke in French*): We had no intention of getting into an argument about this. We are all in agreement that there is a need to combat terrorism. I simply wanted to offer a point of view. You yourself gave me reason to do so while I listened to you, Mr. Chairman. In English, you said you were citing language from a resolution of the Security Council. You used the words "inter alia", but I must say that I do not see that phrase in the paragraph in question here. If that phrase had been included there, we would not have had this discussion. I just wanted to point that out.

The Chairman (*spoke in French*): I could respond to that point, but I do not want to get into a discussion either. If the representative of Côte d'Ivoire were to compare draft resolutions A/C.1/56/L.49 and A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1, he would see that there is a difference. Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49 makes a specific reference to the Security Council. Here that is not the case. That is why the phrase "inter alia" was removed.

I have no more requests to explain position but, as I mentioned to delegations earlier — and I want to draw their attention specifically to this point — this is a text which is a common denominator. I have spoken to very many delegations. Sometimes I got contradictory amendments and ideas. I tried to identify the basic preoccupations of delegations in order to come up with a structure that is liveable — which is clearly not the ideal scenario, as I said earlier this morning. I think I have to repeat this again. This is not an easy undertaking, even if it sometimes seems that the subject lends itself to easy solutions. Therefore, the text you have before you captures, in essence, the various views and brings them into one draft resolution.

We could have a deferral of 24 hours, which would mean that we will have to meet tomorrow afternoon. But, as I said earlier, this is as far as the Chairman can go. I know what I am talking about because I have spoken to very many delegations, and I know I cannot satisfy everyone. Therefore, I am not going to change this text because if I change the text in one place, others will take exception to the text and want to change it in another place. As I said earlier — I did not think I had to repeat this but I am obliged to — if some delegations believe that this text cannot be adopted without a vote, I will solemnly withdraw it. So, we can meet tomorrow afternoon to give enough

time to the delegations requesting the deferral to meet again, but the text will remain as it stands because I know that if I make changes, it will open Pandora's box. Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 is the only feasible alternative I see which will allow everyone on board. If some delegations believe we cannot do this, then I will withdraw this draft resolution.

In the light of the wish expressed by some delegations to have a 24-hour deferral for action to be taken on A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1, I will have to reconvene the First Committee tomorrow in the same room at 3 p.m. to take action or not to take action on it. Any other requests or observations from the floor?

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): I am not going to talk about draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49. I just have to say something about the physical operation of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia, in Kathmandu, about which the Director of the Department for Disarmament Affairs made a statement to the Committee a few minutes ago.

My intervention is going to be very, very short. I just want to note that when the representative of the Department for Disarmament Affairs spoke to the Committee, he unfortunately left out part of the communication that our mission sent to the Department on 18 October. Although he referred to the fact that the new revisions proposed in the host country agreement will have to be reviewed by the host country authorities, he did not refer to the alternative we suggested in that communication, to the effect that we could go along with the 19 March text right now to expedite the process of the physical operation of the centre in Kathmandu and then restart negotiations on the revisions that they have proposed so recently. My only point at this stage is that we have not yet received a response from the Department to our letter of 18 October 2001.

Mr. Ovia (Papua New Guinea): Normally, we do not take the floor on many issues on the First Committee's agenda. However, although we do not oppose the request made to the Chairman for a deferral of 24 hours, we feel that it would not be the best use of United Nations resources for the Committee to return in 24 hours to consider one draft resolution. Therefore, we would ask those delegations that have difficulty with this draft resolution to perhaps agree to defer action for half an hour or less. If they do not agree, the proposal the Chairman has made sounds like a good one to us. If there is no consensus in this room, we will defer to the Chairman's proposal.

The Chairman: If the request for a deferral is maintained, I will obviously have to reconvene the Committee, no matter how strange it might seem, for one single resolution.

Mr. Lint (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): I do not know if this solution would be acceptable to a majority of those present, but perhaps a little coffee break might yield a solution.

The Chairman: Belgium's suggestion is pretty much what we heard from Papua New Guinea. I have been looking at the floor and there has been no reaction whatsoever. That proposal might provide a way out for those who feel that they have to have a second look at this, but the Chair cannot decide. It obviously depends on those delegations who requested a deferral. Again, I am scrutinizing the hall. If there is a favourable reaction to this proposal, we could take a pause and reconvene in about half an hour, and then dispense with the work in the course of today. I am now turning to those delegations who initiated the question of deferral to see if they agree with the suggestion made by two delegations.

Again — as one can see — no one is reacting to these suggestions, I have to deduce that the suggestion of having a coffee break or a suspension for half an hour does not meet the expectations of those who requested a deferral. In the light of this, with some sadness, I have to say that we are not able to wind up the Committee's work today. We will have to reconvene tomorrow in this conference room at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/56/PV.24

General Assembly

Fifty-sixth session

Official Records

First Committee

24th meeting

Tuesday, 6 November 2001, 3 p.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdös ..... (Hungary)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 64 to 84 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: I thank members for their patience. Important consultations have been going on. The First Committee will conclude the third phase of its work, namely, action on all draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security agenda items, in the course of today. This afternoon the Committee will take action on the remaining draft resolution, namely A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1.

Before proceeding to take action, I shall call on those delegations wishing to make general statements, other than in explanation of their position or vote on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1.

Mr. Bakhit (Sudan): On behalf of the African Group, I should like to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1.

First, I express our gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, for your initiative in proposing the original draft, and for the painstaking efforts you made to accommodate the divergent views and proposals you received, from various sources, in order to arrive at the revision contained in document A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1. We realize that yours was not an easy task, especially in trying to match the "common denominator", as you put it yesterday, with the complex issue of non-proliferation. You worked hard and succeeded in capturing the essence of the Committee's concern about the status of multilateral cooperation in disarmament and non-proliferation, and emerging global solidarity in countering terrorism in all its forms and manifestations.

The African Group would like to thank you, Sir, for incorporating some of its proposals into the revised draft that you presented to the Committee yesterday. Having said that, we would like to underscore the principle that no draft resolution is impregnable or cast in stone. A draft resolution is not a resolution until it is adopted by a vote, or without a vote. As we witnessed yesterday, oral revisions or amendments can be made to drafts before action is taken on them. So although the request for a postponement of action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 may have come as a surprise to some, it was certainly not unprecedented.

I should add that the request was essentially to strengthen the resolve of the Chair to achieve consensus. In other words, we were determined to ensure the draft would be adopted without a vote. That is exactly what the Chairman wanted and that was why he made his appeal. Moreover, the request was prompted by the imperative, even at that late hour, to bring on board those members of the Group that still had some difficulty with very important elements of the operative parts of the Chairman's revised draft. The intention was that action should be taken as far as possible without any reservation expressed by an African delegation on the floor either before or after such action.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

01-62327 (E)

On behalf of the African Group I should like to assure the Committee that the Group has always demonstrated flexibility in all negotiations on issues before the Committee. Indeed in the course of this session we were obliged to delete certain paragraphs of draft resolutions that are vital to the security interests of member States of the African region. We made concessions in order to ensure that those with divergent views on issues dear to us would at least associate themselves with our position without resorting to a vote.

I can assure you, Sir, that the African Group will continue to cooperate with other delegations on any issue before the Committee. Indeed we recognize, as I have no doubt other delegations also recognize, that disarmament and non-proliferation are essential to the maintenance of international peace and security. We also recognize that they are vital for the survival of mankind. As one of the most vulnerable areas of the globe in terms of security from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, Africa is determined to help build the common response to the global search in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. All I can say at this point of the Committee's work is that all's well that ends well.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to make a general statement, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "Multilateral cooperation in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation and global efforts against terrorism".

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before action is taken.

Mr. Goussous (Jordan) (*spoke in Arabic*): On behalf of the countries of the Arab League, I should like to reiterate our support for the spirit of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1. I repeat that today we find that we need to reiterate and reinforce multilateral international cooperation in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation and to strengthen international action against terrorism. By basing ourselves on this very important point of view, which is supported by Arab States, we wish to join the consensus on the draft under consideration, although we also endorse the consensus of the Arab States in the several reservations that have been made concerning the actual content of the draft and the way in which it was submitted to the Committee. We feel that any resolution submitted to the Committee should be an instrument for negotiation, and should not be submitted on a

(*spoke in English*)

take-it-or-leave-it basis.

(*spoke in Arabic*)

However, our reservations will be limited to the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution, which contains the essence of the draft. An ambiguous principle is mentioned in that paragraph, namely,

(*spoke in English*)

> "maintaining and strengthening universal norms and enlarging their scope".

(*spoke in Arabic*)

This mention is not suitable here. We repeat, therefore, that the draft resolution, which is indeed extremely important, should have mentioned categorically the total endorsement of States of the non-proliferation and disarmament treaties without any discrimination. Here I wish to state that this draft should have contained the words

(*spoke in English*)

> "universal adherence to disarmament and non-proliferation treaties",

(*spoke in Arabic*)

as can be found in the amendment proposed by the African Group, which was officially requested and transmitted to you, Sir, last week. The omission of this expression will have some negative repercussions on the whole system of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Arab States are joining in the consensus on the draft resolution but nevertheless wish to express a reservation on its operative paragraph 1 for the reasons that I have just explained. I hope that these reservations will be reflected in the official summary record of this meeting.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): First I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your very timely initiative in presenting the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1. Cuba supports this draft resolution because we consider that it is very important that the First Committee should take a stand in the present situation in favour of

multilateral cooperation in the area of disarmament and in favour of global efforts being made in the struggle against terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. The draft resolution submitted at this meeting represents an important step forward when compared with the first version that was put forward; it takes into account a number of the concerns expressed by certain delegations regarding the original text. At the same time, as you, Sir, yourself have said, the draft resolution to be adopted today is not ideal, nor does it fully reflect the aspirations of many delegations.

As is well known, the delegation of Cuba presented a number of amendments to the original draft. We are happy that some of them have been incorporated. We wish to thank the Chairman of the Committee, for example, for having taken into account Cuba's proposal to include a new preambular paragraph making reference to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. We are also grateful that there is a reference in the fourth preambular paragraph to all General Assembly and Security Council resolutions relating to terrorism.

Bearing in mind the little time that we have available and so as not to create any further difficulties for the Chairman as he endeavours to find consensus, Cuba decided not to press all its other amendments. My delegation would have preferred that the draft resolution explicitly refer to the central role that the General Assembly of the United Nations should play with regard to terrorism. We would have preferred that there be a reference to the need to completely eliminate weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, as this would have been a concrete contribution to the global struggle against terrorism. It is our conviction that as long as weapons of mass destruction exist, there is a very great danger of their falling into the hands of terrorists. Furthermore, although the fourth preambular paragraph refers to some specific resolutions, that should not be interpreted to mean that certain resolutions on the subject of terrorism are more important than others. We believe that all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council are complementary and, taken together, they show the determination of the international community to fight the threat of terrorism. In spite of its limitations the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 would be a very significant achievement of the present session. For that reason Cuba will give it its support and we hope that it can be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Lint (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): On behalf of the European Union I should like to make a short statement on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1.

At the beginning of this session of the First Committee the European Union felt that multilateral cooperation in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation was needed more than ever in order to fight against terrorism. Of course no draft can be perfect but we feel that today there is a common denominator and a balance between the various interests that have been expressed on this very important subject and we consider that your draft, Sir, reflects our position very well. That is why the European Union is able to support your text.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "Multilateral cooperation in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation and global efforts against terrorism", which was introduced by the Chairman of the First Committee at the Committee's 13th meeting, on 23 October 2001.

The Chairman: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Méndez (Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Venezuela wishes to say that it is pleased that the draft resolution has received support. That reflects the commitment of member States to the goal of disarmament and non-proliferation and the struggle against terrorism. Venezuela reiterates that multilateral action is the best kind of action to promote solutions of common interest, which by their very nature and scope require collective action based on dialogue and

cooperation. In the areas covered by draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1, the United Nations, with its experience and legitimacy, is the right place to make progress towards the strengthening of peace and international security.

The Chairman: As there are no more delegations wishing to speak in explanation of their position on the draft resolution just adopted, I call on the representative of South Africa who has asked for the floor to make a statement on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

Mr. Du Preez (South Africa): Is this the appropriate time to make a general statement upon the conclusion of the Committee's work?

The Chairman: Yes, this is the right time.

Mr. Du Preez (South Africa): On behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are member States of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and other States associated with the Movement, I wish to thank you, Sir, for guiding the work of the First Committee to its successful conclusion. I should also like to thank the members of the Bureau and the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Dhanapala, staff members of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Sattar, and the Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament for their role in assisting delegations during this session of the Committee. Last, but not least, I wish to thank Conference Services and the interpreters and translators who have been essential to the Committee's work.

Mr. Zaidan (Lebanon): I speak for Lebanon, in its capacity as Chair of the Arab Group this month. I thank you, Sir, the Under-Secretary-General, the Committee Secretary and everyone who has enabled the First Committee to conduct its work thoroughly, including those in the background, the interpreters, and so forth. We wish to thank you, Sir, for your patience and able leadership in conducting the work of the Committee. Even at difficult times you proved to have exceptional patience and understanding and you have truly cooperated with all sides concerned with our work. I should also like to thank you for your eloquence. We have heard you speak in almost every language, except perhaps Chinese. It is never easy being chairman, especially in the First Committee, and you have proved that you are able to listen to all groups. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lint (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): At a time when the work of the First Committee is about to conclude I should like to say a few words on behalf of the European Union, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union, namely, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway as countries of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) and European Economic Area.

We wish to extend our warmest congratulations to you, Sir, for the efficiency, courtesy and sense of humour with which you have conducted the work of the Committee. We also congratulate you on your initiative, which has led to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/56/L.49/Rev.1 on which we have just adopted.

We also wish to extend our congratulations and thanks to all members of the Secretariat team, who have been able to meet the demands of all delegations. We thank in particular Mr. Sattar, Secretary of the First Committee, whose experience and serenity have been extremely useful to us. We also include in our thanks all the interpreters and translators who, as usual, have carried out some remarkable work, as well as those in charge of Conference Services who have given us essential logistical support.

In conclusion, we would like to express our appreciation of the spirit of cooperation that has been present here and we hope that that spirit of cooperation will always be present in our future sessions as well.

Mr. Bakhit (Sudan) (*spoke in French*): On behalf of the African Group, I should like to thank you, Sir, for having led the work of the Committee this year. I also express our appreciation to the Under-Secretary-General and the Secretary of the Committee, the members of the Secretariat and the interpreters for the excellent work that they have carried out this year.

Mr. Coutts (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of the Rio Group, I should like to thank you, Sir, and your entire team for your hard work in achieving the success that we have enjoyed during the session.

The Chairman: I should like at this time to take a few minutes to make a short statement in my capacity as Chairman of the First Committee at the end of the Committee's work.

This year's deliberations in the First Committee took place in the aftermath of the horrible terrorist attacks in the United States. I might recall in this connection what Secretary-General Kofi Annan said in his earlier report on the tragedy of [Srebrenica] in Bosnia when he stated that "evil exists".

Yes, we have become more conscious that we live in a dangerous world where evil exists, where conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction could be used for evil purposes, as a means of terrorist attacks against innocent civilians. Such sentiments were expressed during this fifty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly by practically everyone in various forums dealing with the issue of terrorism: the General Assembly, the Security Council, the main committees and forums elsewhere.

From the very beginning of our work in this Committee, it was clear that based on our own mandate, the mandate of the First Committee, we had to respond with seriousness and urgency to the requirements of the present time and redouble our efforts so that in this messy world real and substantive disarmament and non-proliferation measures could be undertaken. The Committee went through all the clusters in high gear, discussing and taking action on issues related to nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons, regional disarmament, disarmament machinery, and many other items related to disarmament and international security questions. The statements heard by and the drafts submitted to the Committee represented the full range of issues that preoccupy us at present. On the whole we have had a thought-provoking and fruitful session of the First Committee, which took place in a constructive, sometimes tense, sometimes funny atmosphere. We adopted 44 draft resolutions and 6 draft decisions, 30 of which were adopted without a vote. I have clearly no intention of summarizing, let alone assessing, the results of our deliberations. That evaluation will be done by yourselves and your Governments. I just want to express my confidence that the political will to do more in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation will be preserved in each and every one of your capitals.

I would also express my special appreciation to all the members of the First Committee for having adopted without a vote a draft resolution on multilateral cooperation against terrorism. In the eyes of the outside world, this should be construed as a manifestation of an international consensus that the new challenges faced by the community of nations at the beginning of this century need a common response and that the global threats can be addressed through multilateral efforts. That is the essence of the action we took a moment ago in this connection, and I am deeply convinced that it does serve the interests of us all.

I wish to conclude my statement by thanking first, all members of the First Committee for the cooperation they have extended to me during this session. It was indeed a privilege for me to work with people so knowledgeable in the field of disarmament. In addition, I thank you for your support in my efforts to use the time and conference facilities allocated to the First Committee in the most effective manner, thus saving United Nations resources so badly needed for other activities. That allowed us to finish our work today, four meetings earlier than scheduled.

I also wish to express my appreciation to the Vice-Chairmen of the Committee, Ambassador Milos Alcalay of Venezuela, Mr. Stéphane De Loecker of Belgium, Mr. Lee Kie-cheon of the Republic of Korea, and to our Rapporteur, Mr. Sylvester Ekundayo Rowe of Sierra Leone. I am grateful for their assistance and cooperation in discharging the mandates entrusted to us.

Let me, on behalf of the Committee and on my own behalf, offer our most sincere thanks for Mr. Jayantha Dhanapala, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, as well as to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Mohammad Sattar, and all his staff members in the Secretariat for their valuable and indispensable assistance.

Finally, I wish to extend my special thanks to our interpreters, translators, record keepers, press officers, conference and document officers, the sound engineers and all those who work behind the scenes to bring the activities of the Committee to a successful conclusion.

To those who fly back to Geneva or their respective capitals I wish you bon voyage.

Before concluding, I have had another request for the floor, from the representative of Iraq.

Mr. Matook (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): I am sorry I have to make a statement at this late hour in the meeting, but it behoves me to pay tribute to your efforts, Sir, your patience and your wisdom, which have contributed to the successful conclusion of the work entrusted to us under your leadership. That is clear to everyone here. We wish to thank the Secretariat, the interpreters and all those who have made efforts at the meetings of the Committee, namely the Member States.

We also especially wish to thank the members who supported the draft resolution presented by Iraq on the effects of the use of depleted uranium in armaments. We hope that draft resolution will help the work of the Committee to rid the world of all weapons of mass destruction — weapons that jeopardize international peace and security in this world of ours.

The Chairman: If there is nothing else we can do together at this point in time, I wish to announce that the 2001 session of the First Committee has thus completed its task and, with a heavy heart, I say that this meeting is concluded.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.